UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/709,616	05/18/2004	Sujatha Ramanathan	839-1204	3615

30024 7590 08/02/2006

NIXON & VANDERHYE P.C.
901 NORTH GLEBE ROAD, 11TH FLOOR
ARLINGTON, VA 22203

EXAMINER	
PULLIAM, CHRISTYANN R	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2191	

DATE MAILED: 08/02/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/709,616	RAMANATHAN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Christyann Pulliam	2191	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *18 May 2004*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-14* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-14* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *18 May 2004* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-14, as filed on May 18, 2004, are pending for examination.

Specification

2. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: reference numbers 40 and 42 are not discussed. The drawings contain the reference numbers 40 and 42. However, the specification does not contain a description of those references numbers. See C.F.R. § 1.84(p). Appropriate correction is required.

3. The disclosure is objected to because the description of Figure 1 is confusing. Referring to servers 1-3 is confusing since there is also a computer 2 and network 3. It would be clearer if the servers were either named something other than numbers or just used numbers that were not also references numbers. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Objections

4. The claims are objected to because of the following informalities: the lack of the phrase "We claim" at the start of the claims. See MPEP 608.01(m). Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

5. 35 U.S.C. § 101 reads as follows:

> Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

6. Claims 1-3, 6-8 and 11-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

7. Claims 1-3, 6-8 and 11-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because they fail to produce a tangible result. There is no tangible result in Claim 1 because the results of the search are not presented to the user or another system or method where it can be useful. Claims 2 and 3 do not add a tangible result to Claim 1. Claims 6-8 and 11-12 have the same issue. These claims contain non-statutory subject matter.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

8. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. § 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

9. Claims 1-4, and 11-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Cambot et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,555,403 (hereinafter Cambot).

10. As for Claim 1, Cambot teaches:

In a computer system, a method of searching through metadata from a plurality of data tables concurrently, the data tables being defined by a schema and stored in a database(s) (See e.g. col. 1, lines 8-20, and Claim 1), the method comprising:

generating a graphical user interface, the graphical user interface having at least one item including a predefined instruction label which is associated with a corresponding SQL query for defining a search through the metadata from the plurality of data tables (See e.g. Claims 1, 3, 5 and 14 and Figures 3-22);

receiving user input, through the graphical user interface, selecting the schema and selecting the item having the predefined instruction label (See e.g. Claims 1 and 3); and

processing the received user input so as to conduct a concurrent search through metadata from the plurality of tables, the type of search being based on the selected item having the predefined instruction label (See e.g. Claims 1, 3 and 10 and Figure 23).

11. As for Claim 2, Cambot teaches:

A method of claim 1, wherein each of the tables includes at least one column and the concurrent search through metadata from the plurality of tables involves concurrently searching for column names of the plurality of tables defined by the schema (See e.g. Claims 1 and 3 and Figures 3-22).

12. As for Claim 3, Cambot teaches:

A method of claim 1, wherein the graphical user interface includes a user select menu allowing selection of the item having the predefined instruction label associated

with the corresponding SQL query from among a list having at least one other item having another predefined instruction label associated with another SQL query (See e.g. Claim 1 and 3 and Figures 3-22).

13. As for Claim 4, Cambot teaches:

A method of claim 1, further comprising outputting data obtained as a result of the search in a dynamic chart (See e.g. col. 15, lines 35-40 and Figure 35).

14. As for Claim 11, Cambot teaches:

A computerized graphical user interface capable of searching through metadata from a plurality of data tables defined by a schema and stored in a database, the graphical user interface comprising:

a user selection menu including a list of items having respective predefined instruction labels associated with respective SQL queries each of which defines a search through the metadata from the plurality of data tables defined by the schema (See e.g. Claims 1, 3, and 5 and Figures 3-22); and

a display window displaying the results of a processed SQL query that corresponds to the predefined instruction label of the item that is selected by the user utilizing the user selection menu from among the list of items, the processing of the SQL query including conducting a concurrent search through metadata from the plurality of tables, the type of concurrent search being based on the selected item (See e.g. Claims 1, 3 and 10).

15. As for Claim 12, Cambot teaches:

A computerized graphical user interface of claim 11, wherein the concurrent search through metadata from the plurality of tables involves concurrently searching for column names of the plurality of tables (See e.g. Claims 1 and 3 and Figures 3-22).

16. As for Claim 13, Cambot teaches:

A computerized graphical user of claim 11 further comprising a user selectable button for enabling generation of a dynamic chart reflecting the results of the processed SQL query (See e.g. col. 15, lines 35-40 and Figure 35).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

17. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

18. Claims 5 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cambot as applied to claims above, and further in view of Yeager et al. U.S. Patent No. 5,950,190 (hereinafter Yeager).

19. As for Claim 5, Cambot teaches:

A method of claim 1, wherein the SQL query associated with the predefined instruction label of the selected item is displayed in a window defined by the graphical user interface (See e.g. Figures 25, 28, and 32-33).

20. Cambot does not teach modifying the SQL manually. However, Yeager teaches the SQL query being modifiable through change(s) input through the window or through a separate SQL query modification window also defined by the graphical user interface (See e.g. col. 1, lines 47-58).

21. As for Claim 14, Cambot teaches:

A computerized graphical user interface of claim 11 further comprising a query window displaying the SQL query associated with the predefined instruction label of the selected item (See e.g. Figures 25, 28, and 32-33).

22. Cambot does not teach modifying the SQL manually. However, Yeager teaches the SQL query being modifiable through change(s) input through the query window or through a separate SQL query modification window defined by the graphical user interface (See e.g. col. 1, lines 47-58).

23. Cambot and Yeager are from the analogous art of user interfaces for access to data in a database. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Cambot and Yeager.

24. The motivation to combine Cambot and Yeager comes from the citation and comments in Yeager to Cambot. Additionally both are directed towards providing access to users to data in databases without requiring SQL knowledge.

25. Claims 6-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cambot and further in view of Ensor, U.S. Patent No. 6,609,122 (hereinafter Ensor).

26. As for Claim 6, Cambot teaches:

receiving user input, through the graphical user interface, selecting one of the schemas and selecting the item having the predefined instruction label for defining a search through metadata from a plurality of tables defined by the selected schema (See e.g. Claims 1 and 3); and

processing the received user input so as to conduct a concurrent search through metadata from the plurality of tables, the type of search being based on the selected schema and the selected item (See e.g. Claims 1, 3 and 10 and Figure 23).

27. Cambot does not teach multiple databases. However, Ensor teaches:

In a computer system including a first database having a first data platform format and a second database having a second data platform format which is different than the first data platform format, a method comprising:

generating a graphical user interface including a user input portion for enabling user selection of one of the first and second databases and allowing the user to switch access between the first and second databases;

receiving a user selection of one of the first and second databases through the user input portion of the graphical user interface;

updating the graphical user interface upon receipt of at least the user selection of one of the first and second databases so that the graphical user interface presents a plurality of schemas defining organization of a plurality of tables in the selected database and at least one item including a predefined instruction label associated with a corresponding SQL query for defining a search through metadata from a plurality of tables defined by a particular schema (See e.g. Figures 4-6 and their descriptions).

28. Cambot and Ensor are from the analogous art of user interfaces for access to data in a database. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Cambot and Ensor.

29. The motivation to combine Cambot and Ensor comes from their common goals of providing users access to their data in databases. As stated in Ensor, "DBAs and database users desire the ability to quickly browse and edit data residing in database tables" (See col. 2, lines 26-28). Both Ensor and Cambot provide this functionality. Ensor adds the functionality that permits the data to be in multiple databases. This is a natural advancement found in the newer patent of Ensor that takes into consideration the modern need for users to access data in more than just a single database. In today's business world, users would want to use the common interface presented in Cambot to access all their data in multiple databases, which Ensor would allow them to do.

30. As for Claim 7, Cambot as modified by Ensor above teaches the method of Claim 6. Cambot also teaches wherein each of the tables includes at least one column and the concurrent search through metadata from the plurality of tables defined by the schema involves concurrently searching for column names of the plurality of tables defined by the schema (See e.g. Claims 1 and 3 and Figures 3-22).

31. As for Claim 8, Cambot as modified by Ensor above teaches the method of Claim 6. Cambot also teaches wherein the updated graphical user interface includes a user select menu allowing selection of the item having the predefined instruction label associated with the corresponding SQL query from among a list having at least one

other item having another predefined instruction label associated with another SQL query (See e.g. Claims 1 and 3 and Figures 3-22).

32. As for Claim 9, Cambot as modified by Ensor above teaches the method of Claim 6. Cambot also teaches further comprising outputting data obtained as a result of the search in a dynamic chart (See e.g. col. 15, lines 35-40 and Figure 35).

33. Cambot and Ensor are from the analogous art of user interfaces for access to data in a database. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Cambot and Ensor.

34. The motivation to combine Cambot and Ensor comes from their common goals of providing users access to their data in databases. As stated in Ensor, "DBAs and database users desire the ability to quickly browse and edit data residing in database tables" (See col. 2, lines 26-28). Both Ensor and Cambot provide this functionality. Ensor adds the functionality that permits the data to be in multiple databases. This is a natural advancement found in the newer patent of Ensor that takes into consideration the modern need for users to access data in more than just a single database. In today's business world, users would want to use the common interface presented in Cambot to access all their data in multiple databases, which Ensor would allow them to do.

35. Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cambot in view of Ensor, U.S. Patent No. 6,609,122 (hereinafter Ensor) as applied to

claim 6 above, and further in view of Yeager et al. U.S. Patent No. 5,950,190 (hereinafter Yeager).

36. As for Claim 10, Cambot as modified by Ensor above teaches the method of Claim 6. Cambot also teaches wherein the SQL query associated with the selected predefined instruction label of the selected item is displayed in a window defined by the updated graphical user interface (See e.g. Figures 25, 28, and 32-33).

37. Cambot does not teach modifying the SQL manually. However, Yeager teaches the SQL query being modifiable through change(s) input through the window or through a separate SQL query modification window defined by the updated graphical user interface (See e.g. col. 1, lines 47-58).

38. Cambot, Yeager and Ensor are from the analogous art of user interfaces for access to data in a database. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Cambot, Yeager and Ensor.

39. The motivation to combine Cambot and Yeager comes from the citation and comments in Yeager to Cambot. Additionally both are directed towards providing access to users to data in databases without requiring SQL knowledge. The motivation to combine Cambot and Ensor comes from their common goals of providing users access to their data in databases. As stated in Ensor, "DBAs and database users desire the ability to quickly browse and edit data residing in database tables" (See col. 2, lines 26-28). Both Ensor and Cambot provide this functionality. Ensor adds the functionality that permits the data to be in multiple databases. This is a natural advancement found in the newer patent of Ensor that takes into consideration the

modern need for users to access data in more than just a single database. In today's business world, users would want to use the common interface presented in Cambot to access all their data in multiple databases, which Ensor would allow them to do.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Christyann Pulliam whose telephone number is 571-270-1007. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th 7:30 am-5 pm, every other Fri 7:30am-4pm EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Bruce can be reached on 571-272-2487. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

CRTP

DAVID V. BRUCE
PRIMARY EXAMINER